



# Supreme Court of Wisconsin

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

110 E. MAIN STREET, SUITE 215

P.O. BOX 1688

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

Shirley S. Abrahamson  
Chief Justice

Telephone (608) 266-1880

TTY Users: Call WI TRS at 1-800-947-3529; request (608) 266-1880

Fax (608) 267-0640

Web Site: [www.wicourts.gov](http://www.wicourts.gov)

A. John Voelker  
Director of State Courts  
and  
Acting Clerk of Supreme Court

## WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

### MAY 2010

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of May 2010 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2009.

#### Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 8 cases in May. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

	<u>May 2010</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion .....	<u>8</u>	<u>42</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases .....	3	29
Judicial disciplinary cases .....	0	0
Civil cases .....	3	7
Criminal cases .....	2	6

#### Petitions for Review

A total of 61 petitions for review were filed during the month. A petition for review asks the Supreme Court to review the decision of the Court of Appeals. The Supreme Court's jurisdiction is discretionary, meaning that review is granted in selected cases only. In May, the Supreme Court disposed of 57 petitions for review, of which 5 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 173 petitions for review pending.

	<u>May 2010</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed .....	<u>61</u>	<u>536</u>
Civil cases .....	27	261
Criminal cases .....	34	275

Petition for Review dispositions .....	<u>57</u>	<u>603</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	29 (4)	320 (29)
Criminal cases (petitions granted) .....	28 (1)	283 (15)

### Petitions for Bypass

In May, the Supreme Court received no petitions for bypass and disposed of no petitions for bypass. In a petition for bypass, a party requests that the Supreme Court take jurisdiction of an appeal or other proceeding pending in the Court of Appeals. A matter appropriate for bypass is usually one which meets one or more of the criteria for review by the Supreme Court and one the Supreme Court concludes it will ultimately choose to consider regardless of how the Court of Appeals might decide the issues. A petition for bypass may also be granted where there is a clear need to hasten the ultimate appellate decision. The Supreme Court currently has no petitions for bypass pending.

	<u>May 2010</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed .....	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>
Civil cases .....	0	9
Criminal cases .....	0	0
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>12</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	10 (1)
Criminal cases (petitions granted) .....	0 (0)	2 (0)

### Requests for Certification

During May 2010, the Supreme Court received no requests for certification and disposed of one request for certification. In a request for certification, the Court of Appeals asks the Supreme Court to exercise its appellate jurisdiction before the Court of Appeals hears the matter. A request for certification is decided on the basis of the same criteria as a petition to bypass. The Supreme Court currently has no requests for certification pending.

	<u>May 2010</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed.....	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>
Civil cases .....	0	7
Criminal cases .....	0	1
Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>1</u>	<u>10</u>
Civil cases (requests granted) .....	1 (1)	8 (8)
Criminal cases (requests granted) .....	0 (0)	2 (0)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 2 matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) were filed and 0 such cases were reopened. The Supreme Court also received 4 petitions for supervisory writ, which ask the Supreme Court to order the Court of Appeals or a circuit court to take a certain action in a case. One original action was filed. An original action is a petition asking the Supreme Court to take jurisdiction over a particular matter. When an opinion is issued in these cases, the disposition is included in “Opinions Issued by the Court” above; otherwise, the case is disposed of by order and is included in the totals below. The Supreme Court currently has 22 regulatory matters and 10 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

	<u>May 2010</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	2	29
Judicial discipline.....	0	1
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ .....	4	43
Other (including Original Actions).....	1	7
 <u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	1	15
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ .....	4	53
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	10

**DECISIONS BY THE  
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT**

**OPINIONS ISSUED DURING MAY 2010**

**ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE CASES**

<b><u>Docket No.</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>
2007AP002604-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) v. Glenn J. Blise Public Reprimand Per Curiam <sup>1</sup>	05/12/2010
2007AP002617-D	OLR v. Scott F. Anderson 60 Day Suspension Per Curiam	05/21/2010
2009AP000774-D	OLR v. Joan M. Boyd Public Reprimand Per Curiam	05/27/2010

**CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES**

<b><u>Docket No.</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>
2009AP001021	Estate of James F. Sheppard v. Jessica Schleis Circuit Court order and judgment affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Abrahamson, C.J.	05/04/2010
2008AP001684	Milwaukee Symphony Orchestra v. DOR Court of Appeals decision affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Abrahamson, C.J. <u>Concurrence/Dissent</u> : Roggensack, J., joined by Gableman, J.	05/05/2010
2008AP000919	James Zarder v. Acuity, A Mutual Insurance Company Court of Appeals decision affirmed and cause remanded. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Bradley, J.	05/14/2010

---

<sup>1</sup> “Per Curiam” means “by the Court.” Opinions issued *per curiam* are handed down by the Court as a whole.

2008AP000552-CR	State v. Scott R. Jensen Court of Appeals decision reversed and remanded to the circuit court. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Roggensack, J. <u>Concurrence</u> : Abrahamson, C.J., joined by Bradley, J. Prosser, J. did not participate.	05/20/2010
2008AP001185-CR	State v. Michael J. Carter Court of Appeals decision reversed. <u>Majority Opinion</u> : Zeigler, J. <u>Concurrence</u> : Bradley, J., joined by Abrahamson, C.J.	05/25/2010